DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 430 762 RC 021 993

AUTHOR Howley-Rowe, Caitlin

TITLE Evaluation of Quest Elementary and High School Rally, November 1998.
INSTITUTION Appalachia Educational Lab., Charleston, WV.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 1998-12-00
NOTE 45p.
CONTRACT RJ96006001
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative (142)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Change Agents; Change Strategies; Collegiality; *Educational Change; Educational Cooperation; Elementary Secondary Education; *Interschool Communication; Needs Assessment; *Networks; *Professional Development; Program Evaluation; *Regional Cooperation
IDENTIFIERS Reflective Inquiry; *School Improvement Teams

ABSTRACT

As part of its contract to develop a framework for continuous school improvement in its four-state region (Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia), Appalachia Educational Laboratory staff designed the Quest project. Based upon principles of inquiry, collaboration, and action research, Quest supports and investigates ongoing school improvement efforts through rallies, summer symposia, a Scholars program, visits to participating schools, communication via listserv and mailings, and the creation of a Quest network of schools. This report describes and assesses a combined elementary and high school networks rally, held on November 2-3, 1998, near Daniels, West Virginia. Forty parents, students, teachers, and administrators from 10 elementary, high, and K-12 schools in Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia, and Kentucky participated. Evaluation data were generated by evaluator participant observation, unstructured interviews, two feedback forms, and pre-rally and follow-up questionnaires. Data indicate that the rally's six goals--connect with colleagues, create a learning community, connect with concepts related to continuous school improvement, create personal and shared meaning, commit to continue learning with this community, and commit to continue this Quest back home--were met very well. Participants reported that the goal of committing to continue Quest-related efforts at their schools had been best achieved, and many communicated a variety of plans they intended to undertake. Attendees also found the strategies modeled by Quest staff for data collection and needs assessment and the review of the Quest framework for continuous improvement quite useful. Appendices present the pre-rally questionnaire, feedback forms, and the evaluation standards checklist. Contains 17 references. (Author/TD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 430 762

Evaluation of QUEST Elementary and High School Rally, November 1998

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Caitlin Howley-Rowe

Appalachia Educational Laboratory, Inc.
P.O. Box 1348 • Charleston WV 25325 • 800-624-9120

RC 021993

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Evaluation of Quest Elementary and High School Rally, November 1998

Caitlin Howley-Rowe

December 1998

Quest Project
Appalachia Educational Laboratory
Post Office Box 1348
Charleston, West Virginia 25325

RC 021993

AEL's mission is to link the knowledge from research with the wisdom from practice to improve teaching and learning. AEL serves as the Regional Educational Laboratory for Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia. For these same four states, it operates both a Regional Technology Consortium and the Eisenhower Regional Consortium for Mathematics and Science Education. In addition, it serves as the Region IV Comprehensive Technical Assistance Center and operates the ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools.

Information about AEL projects, programs, and services is available by writing or calling AEL.

Appalachia Educational Laboratory
Post Office Box 1348
Charleston, West Virginia 25325-1348
304/347-0400
800/624-9120 (toll-free)
304/347-0487 (Fax)
aelinfo@ael.org
http://www.ael.org

This publication is based on work sponsored wholly or in part by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U. S. Department of Education, under contract number RJ96006001. Its contents do not necessarily reflect the views of OERI, the Department, or any other agency of the U. S. Government.

AEL is an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Employer.

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY ii

INTRODUCTION 1

METHODOLOGY 3

RALLY ACTIVITIES 5

- Day One 5
- Day Two 12

FINDINGS 19

- Pre-rally Follow up 19
- Achievement of Rally Goals 21
  - Goal One: Connect with Colleagues 21
  - Goal Two: Create a Learning Community 22
  - Goal Three: Connect with Concepts Related to Continuous School Improvement 23
  - Goal Four: Create Personal and Shared Meaning 24
  - Goal Five: Commit to Continue Learning with This Community 25
  - Goal Six: Commit to Continue the Quest Back Home 25

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 26

- Conclusions 26
- Recommendations 28

REFERENCES 29

APPENDIXES 31

- A: Pre-Rally Questionnaire
- B: Feedback Forms
- C: Completed Evaluation *Standards* Checklist

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

As part of its contract to develop a framework for continuous school improvement in its four-state region, Appalachia Educational Laboratory (AEL) staff designed the Quest project. Based upon principles of inquiry, collaboration, and action research, Quest proposes to support and investigate ongoing school improvement efforts through bi-annual conferences (which staff renamed rallies), summer symposia, a Scholars program, visits to participating schools, communication via listserv and mailings, and the creation of a Quest network of schools. This evaluation report describes and assesses a combined elementary and high school networks rally, convened November 2-3, 1998.

Ten schools were represented at the rally over the course of the two days—six elementary schools, three high schools, and one combined K-12 school. Of these, one was a private parochial K-8 school. Two schools were located in Tennessee, two in Virginia, five in West Virginia, and one in Kentucky. Teams included one to eight members; a total of 40 participants attended. Of these, seven were principals (three of these, however, were principals for the elementary, middle, and high school levels at the consolidated school), one assistant principal, 25 were teachers, four were parents (mothers), and three were students (boys). In terms of overall participant gender, 11 men and 29 women attended. Of the 40 participants, only one appeared to belong to a racially defined group (Latina). In addition, six AEL staff attended, five of whom were affiliated with the Quest project.

The rally was evaluated in terms of whether, and to what extent, the conference goals were met. To this end, a variety of data was gathered: field notes were taken during evaluator participant observation of all conference activities; participants completed a pre-rally questionnaire, and two written feedback forms; and unstructured interviews were conducted throughout the rally. The follow-up questionnaire also enabled assessment of the impact earlier Quest events had upon participating schools.

Analysis of the feedback data revealed that participants thought the rally goals had been very well met. On a 5-point Likert-type scale, mean ratings of the degree to which goals were achieved ranged from 4.51 (SD .56) to 4.81 (SD .46). In addition, attendees reported finding quite useful the strategies modeled by Quest staff for data collection and needs assessment and the review of the Quest framework for continuous improvement. Participants reported that the goal of committing to continue Quest-related efforts back at their schools had been best achieved, and many communicated a variety of plans they intended to undertake. The follow up data from prior events suggested that participants found them useful springboards to further improvement efforts.

Based upon the data, the evaluator concluded that the rally had continued to provide support and encouragement to those undertaking continuous school improvement. Recommendations included continuing to model a variety of techniques for needs assessment as well as for implementation and evaluation concerns, supporting meaningful student and parent participation, and again offering a review of the framework at upcoming gatherings.

INTRODUCTION

In the summer of 1996, Quest staff at the Appalachia Educational Laboratory (AEL) began working with teams from school communities in three West Virginia county school districts to invigorate efforts for continuous school improvement, using a variety of techniques for gathering input from all those with a stake in their local schools (Howley-Rowe, 1998g). This first "learning community," called Leadership to Unify School Improvement Efforts (LUSIE), was comprised of school teams including students, teachers, administrators, parents, and community members. Ultimately, this group wrote individual school visions and improvement plans, and co-authored (with AEL) *Creating Energy for School Improvement* (1997), a supplemental guide for those poised to write their own state-mandated school improvement plans.

Quest staff also were committed to creating learning communities devoted to exploring continuous school improvement across the AEL region of Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia. Hence, staff scheduled a pilot Inquiry Into Improvement conference in April 1997 for selected region high schools. Schools were selected in several ways. Some schools were recommended for the Quest experience by central office staff or school administrators. Other schools were asked to join Quest because they had participated in previous AEL programs. Still other schools were invited because Quest staff believed they were primed for the kind of collaborative inquiries into school improvement Quest was designed to provide.

In October 1997, in Roanoke, Virginia, another conference was held for designated high schools in AEL's region, this time with an explicit emphasis on forming and nurturing a network of schools (Howley-Rowe, 1998c). A similar conference was held in Nashville, Tennessee, for designated region elementary schools in November 1997 (Howley-Rowe, 1998a). In order to facilitate the development of a Quest school network and to continue to help invigorate continuous school improvement efforts within network schools, staff planned a sequence of events in 1998 following these initial conferences. Dissatisfied with the conventional and prescriptive connotation of "conference," Quest staff chose to call these network meetings "rallies." Thus, all events previously called conferences are now termed "rallies."

The high school network met a second time February 8-10, 1998, at the Pipestem State Park Resort in West Virginia (Howley-Rowe, 1998d), following which the elementary school network participated in a rally February 22-24, 1998, in Lexington, Kentucky (Howley-Rowe, 1998b). During the summer, eleven network members participated in the Quest Scholars Program, meeting at a colloquium in Charleston, West Virginia, July 16-18, 1998, to collaborate with project staff in ongoing efforts to conceptualize, design, and research Quest (Howley-Rowe, 1998e). And in August, network members and other educators in AEL's region participated in a symposium on assessment of student work (Howley-Rowe, 1998f).

This report summarizes evaluation of a rally of the combined elementary and high school networks, held November 2-3, 1998, at the Glade Springs Resort, near Daniels, West Virginia. The rally is assessed in terms of how well rally goals were met. These goals were to (1) connect with colleagues, (2) create a learning community, (3) connect with concepts related to continuous school

improvement, (4) create personal and shared meaning, (5) commit to continue learning with this community, and (6) commit to continue this Quest back home.

Ten schools were represented at the rally over the course of the two days—six elementary schools, three high schools, and one combined K-12 school. Of these, one was a private parochial K-8 school. Two schools were located in Tennessee, two in Virginia, five in West Virginia, and one in Kentucky. Teams included one to eight members; a total of 40 participants attended. Of these, seven were principals (three of these, however, were principals for the elementary, middle, and high school levels at the consolidated school), one an assistant principal, 25 were teachers, four were parents (mothers), and three were students (boys). In terms of participant gender, 11 men and 29 women attended. Of the 40 participants, only one appeared to belong to a racially defined group (Latina). In addition, six AEL staff attended, five of whom were affiliated with the Quest project.

The primary audience for this report is Quest staff. It is intended to provide information to staff as they make decisions about future rallies and the development of the network. In addition, this report will be a part of an ongoing series of reports about Quest events (Howley-Rowe, 1998a-g). This series will document the evolution of the Quest network and the process whereby staff strive to enable continuous school improvement. Consequently, this report may also prove useful to others interested in building networks or promoting school improvement over time.

One purpose of this report is to assess whether, and to what extent, rally goals were met. The report also attends to participants' assessments of the impact previous project events had upon their schools, their Quest teams, and their individual perceptions. The description and analysis of the rally contribute to ongoing documentation of the Quest project and of the development of the Quest network.

METHODOLOGY

The methods used for this evaluation component of the Quest project were both quantitative and qualitative. During the rally, the evaluator engaged in participant observation (Becker & Geer, 1957; Emerson, 1983; Glazer, 1972; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Patton, 1980), a method highly suited "for studying processes, relationships among people and events, the organization of people and events, continuities over time, and patterns" (Jorgensen, 1989, p. 12). Furthermore, consistent with the Quest paradigm, participant observation involves "a flexible, open-ended, opportunistic process and logic of inquiry through which what is studied constantly is subject to redefinition based on field experience and observation" (Jorgensen, 1989, p. 23). This method "is a commitment to adopt the perspective of those studied by sharing in their . . . experiences" (Denzin, 1989, p. 156), thereby enabling researchers to evaluate how an event or process appears and feels to participants. By "exploit[ing] the capacity that any social actor possesses for learning new cultures, and the objectivity to which this process gives rise," participant observation further produces data that is both rich and valid (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1983, p. 8).

During this rally, the evaluator played a role more akin to what Denzin typifies as "observer as participant," rather than as a complete participant observer (1989). That is, the evaluator's contact with rally attendees was not as a participant in the activities in which they were engaged, but instead as a roaming onlooker and occasional conversationalist. The evaluator sat in on participant group endeavors, watched the large group as the rally unfolded, shared evening entertainment activities, and took advantage of serendipitous occasions to chat.

In order to corroborate the theses generated by participant observation, the evaluator also analyzed data from the feedback forms designed by Quest staff soliciting participant assessment of the process (see Appendix A). Using several data sources in order to corroborate theses is what Brewer and Hunter (1989) call "multimethod research" or "triangulation." This approach posits that the strengths of each method will compensate for the weaknesses in others, ultimately providing a more complete account of that being studied. Hence, in addition to participant observation, three evaluation forms were used to collect further information. One feedback form asked attendees to discuss their experiences during the first day and a half of the rally. This form asked participants to record: "Learnings, insights, aha's from the day," "Ways in which I contributed," "Things I want to explore further," "Things that worked especially well for me," "Things that would have allowed me to contribute more," and "Things to trash." Another feedback form was distributed at the end of the rally and asked participants for their evaluations of specific activities, such as school team planning and review of the Quest framework. This form also provided prompts for attendees to complete based on the rally goals (e.g., "I connected with . . . ," "I am committed to . . ."). Finally, participants were asked to complete a quantitative assessment, using a 5-point Likert scale, of the degree to which rally goals had been achieved.

In addition, participants completed a pre-rally questionnaire immediately prior to the beginning of the rally (see Appendix B). This questionnaire sought participants' perceptions about

the impact the previous Quest rally had on individuals, within school teams, and in the larger school community.

Unstructured interviews were conducted during the course of the rally. As opportunities arose for relatively private conversation, participants were asked to discuss their assessments of the rally generally and of the achievement of rally goals specifically. Interview responses were later categorized and analyzed by theme.

Analyses of participant observation field notes, interview data, evaluation forms, and follow-up forms were made by question, and often by theme. Responses to interview, evaluation, and follow-up form queries were coded and counted according to their similarities in content, as were comments captured during participant observation. Field notes were condensed for inclusion in the descriptive section of this report.

Pseudonyms are used throughout this report for participant and school names in order to protect the anonymity and confidentiality of those involved in the Quest network.

RALLY ACTIVITIES

This section provides detailed description of rally events, as well as of some participant discussions. It is hoped that such description will offer project staff a rich narrative from which they may draw their own insights as they continue to develop Quest.

Day One

Elementary and high school network members met for a combined rally November 2-3, 1998, at the Glade Springs Resort, near Daniels, West Virginia. The rally was held in a conference room, with a tall, angled ceiling and large windows looking onto a cluster of lodgings, at the resort conference center. Placed at an angle near the front of the room were two long tables perpendicular to each other and filled with the facilitators' materials, a slide projector, books, and an overhead projector. Clustered near these tables were seven or eight round tables to accommodate participants. On each table was a small wicker basket containing pens, markers, Post-it note paper in various sizes, scissors, and masking tape. Several displays had been placed on tables along the sides of the conference room. One table held approximately twenty books and other printed resources concerning school improvement, while another displayed photographs of network schools taken by Quest staff during site visits (called co-ventures) to such schools. Quest staff had created a visual depicting the various components, activities, and constituencies of the project, and this was displayed on yet another table. Near one of the two doors providing access to the room was a table filled with other materials, such as Quest binder notebooks with articles, quotes, explications of the project framework, and continuous school improvement resources for participants new to the network; more markers, pens, and printed materials; and participant lists.

The rally was scheduled to begin at 8:30 a.m., with a continental breakfast served in the conference room starting at 7:45 a.m. However, approximately eight participants had already arrived at 7:30 a.m. After helping project staff place notebooks and pre-rally questionnaires at each table, the evaluator shared breakfast with the Quest team from Tinder Elementary[1], a school in Kentucky.

The rally officially began at 8:28 a.m., with a welcome from the Quest staff, who announced that this rally differed from earlier rallies because members from both networks were in attendance. Once the two facilitators introduced themselves, they asked school teams to present their teams.

After each school team had introduced themselves, the Quest facilitators thanked the participants for attending and then conducted a review of the project. This review included a description of Quest as "evolving," one facilitator noting that "we didn't sit in our offices and decide what Quest is . . . it's about energizing you, involving you all in creating [Quest], so you can be continually improving." "Quest is a journey, not a program," said another facilitator. In addition, Quest staff used a visual depiction of the project as a small eco-system. And finally, the facilitators

---

[1]Pseudonyms are used throughout this report in place of participant and school names in order to protect the anonymity and confidentiality of those involved in the Quest network.

reviewed the Quest framework and goals for the rally. These goals were to (1) connect with colleagues, (2) create a learning community, (3) connect with concepts related to continuous school improvement, (4) create personal and shared meaning, (5) commit to continue learning with this community, and (6) commit to continue this Quest back home. While explaining the fourth goal, one facilitator shared, "It was interesting to hear a Quest Scholar parent describe Quest as constructivist . . . and our activities do intend to help you construct meaning."

Following the review, the facilitators described the rally agenda. The first day would involve participants becoming reacquainted, school team discussions, and network sharing in the morning, and in the afternoon attendees would revisit the contextual Quest framework components (broadening the learning community, strengthening the learning culture, and sharing leadership) and participate in school team discussions. On the morning of the second day, attendees would participate in sharing across the network, revisiting the creeds created at the two February 1997 rallies, and discussing how to assess student performance as it might be impacted by Quest. In the afternoon, participants would talk within their school teams about how to record their Quest journeys.

Next, the facilitators allotted participants ten minutes to complete the pre-rally questionnaire and to discuss with school teams "what has happened in our school since the last rally . . . and what have we done because of our involvement with Quest?" Answers to these questions were then to be written on large pieces of butcher paper under the headings "prouds" and "sorries." After completing their pre-rally forms, school teams talked quietly for about a minute and then talked more loudly as other participants finished their forms. The evaluator sat with a team from an elementary school, who discussed having "99% participation in parent conferences." One team member quipped, apparently remembering such an instance, "even by cell phone." The team laughed, nodding. The principal appeared to take charge during this activity, soliciting input from other team members and writing their comments on butcher paper. She noted that she had inserted the SMART (Successful, Motivated, Autonomous, Responsible, and Thoughtful) learner concept into the school culture, reporting, for instance, that the bus driver often says such things as "Have a SMART day!" or "Be SMART!" to children as they disembark. One team member said, laughing, "I didn't even realize that was going on." "That's the challenge we face, alone in our rooms," replied another team member.

After approximately 15 minutes of conversation, the facilitators asked participants to converge near the back of the conference room in order to make brief reports from each school team. On the back wall was the Quest time line, depicting project activities beginning in 1996 and continuing into the future. Participants in previous rallies had signed the time line with short descriptions of their activities. And similarly, Quest staff asked attendees to write a brief description of their recent activities in the appropriate space on the time line after completing their reports to the whole group. The facilitators, by way of introducing the activity, shared some of their recent work, describing the project site visits called co-ventures, the Scholars colloquium, and the summer symposium.

Beginning at 9:27 a.m., one representative from each school team took turns sharing their "prouds and sorries." The whole group applauded following each short presentation. The first team reported that they were most proud of having improved their SAT 9 scores, which they had encouraged with the promise of a schoolwide event. A second school shared that they had held a day-long in service, with material drawn from Quest, in order to enhance solidarity amongst their newly consolidated staff. Next, a third school reported having sent teachers to a team leaders conference and feeling an increased sense of leadership by teachers. Too, they said that one of their teachers had been a finalist for a teacher of the year award. SAT scores continued to improve in a fourth school, which also had "the best school opening since 1967." This team reported one "sorry": early into the school year, administration had to redo all student schedules due to computer problems. A fifth school shared that they had held a planning, or "reflection," day for their entire faculty, during which they discussed how to communicate and bond more fully. One team member said she wanted to add that she had attended the Quest rally in Nashville, noting that she "took every Quest idea home . . . we were so impressed with the conference." Another school team described the expansion of their Quest team despite administrative resistance. They added that three more team members would arrive at the rally tomorrow, supporting their participation with their own money and personal leave time. A seventh school reported that they had initiated student-led parent-teacher conferences in grades 3-5 with great success: 80% of parents attended. In addition, achievement scores at this school had increased, with the assistance of new techniques for teaching math and Accelerated Reader (and the attendant incentive that, if students read a certain number of books, the principal would eat worms). An eighth school team reported that their school had held the yearly "mother of all spaghetti dinners," raising $25,000. The school also received three grants and purchased two computers. And a ninth school reported that they were most proud that the co-venture (site visit) with Quest staff "didn't make a nickel of difference [in terms of disrupting or disturbing staff] . . . it was business as usual." The principal also praised the faculty, sharing that they were the "most dedicated, hardworking, committed teachers." She also shared that all teachers had keys to the school building, for which she had received some criticism. In reply, she reported, she had said, "We trust them with the most important part of school—and we can't trust them with silly bricks and mortar?" This received applause from the participants. The facilitators asked attendees to conduct a gallery walk, reading each sheet of paper with each school team's list of "prouds and sorries."

Following this, participants were to take a 15 minute break. During the break, members from various school teams talked with members from other teams, discussing their activities in more depth. One participant said to another, "We're so glad to be here!" A participant approached the evaluator with a question regarding assistance from AEL with grant writing; the evaluator gave the participant the names of two AEL staff members she might contact.

At 10:10 a.m., a facilitator introduced one of the Quest Scholars. The Scholar spoke for several minutes about the project. She said, "Quest is a very safe environment . . . it's ok not to know the answers . . . Through the shared leadership part of Quest we learn that we don't have the answers but that we will learn together." Later she noted that "the intellectual level [in Quest]

elevates [our] thinking," citing discussions of Margaret Wheatley's application of chaos theory to organizational theory and its implications for continuous school improvement. The Scholar also described Quest as a "wellspring of energy and organizing" in which there "are no leaders, no followers, no losers, and no winners."

Next, the facilitators reviewed the Quest framework of continuous improvement in greater detail, describing each component and its relationship to the whole framework. Following this review, staff led participants in a modified Jigsaw activity, focusing on the contextual components of the framework (broadening the learning community, strengthening the learning culture, and sharing leadership). The attendees counted off by six to form groups of approximately five or six members. Although there were only three contextual components upon which to focus in this activity, six groups were created in order to limit the size of each. Hence, two groups read an explication of broadening the learning community, two read about strengthening the learning culture, and the remaining two read about sharing leadership. The facilitators directed participants to write on a Post-it note each major concept they found in their readings. Next, each group was to place their Post-it notes on a piece of butcher paper and then collectively place them into categories, which they were to name.

Participants read quietly from 10:28 to 10:36 a.m., at which point several began to put up their Post-it notes. Gradually all the teams and their members stood up, posting their notes, and arranging categories. The facilitators walked from group to group, offering assistance or reiterating the directions. At 10:45 the facilitators requested each group to name a member to act as "docent," because groups would be traveling from butcher paper to butcher paper reading each and listening to an explanation, given by group docents, regarding the three framework components. The evaluator traveled with one group, listening to the explanations and reading Post-it notes. The first station to which the evaluator traveled displayed shared leadership. The group had discerned six major concepts related to this component: commitment, proactivity, shared goals, respect and trust, [adequate] time necessary, and shifting roles for all involved. After several minutes of discussion, a timer sounded and groups were instructed to continue to the next station. At the second station observed, four major concepts had been identified in relation to broadening the learning community: moral values, co-learners, shared vision, and cooperation. At the third station, the group had written the question "What is a learning culture?" along with several answers: norms, rituals, stories, heros, and vision.

After three rounds, the facilitators ended the activity, participants having visited one station per contextual framework component. Project staff explained that, if the activity had been conducted to completion, each numbered group would have convened to discuss what they had learned at each station.

At 10:55 a.m., the facilitators distributed several handouts regarding the Data in a Day (DIAD) process. One of the project staff then described how one network elementary school came to use this process. She cited the school's involvement with the School Change Collaborative

(SCC), where the principal first learned of DIAD. She also briefly described the process as one for talking with students about how they learn best by involving the school community in data collection. Taking place within 24 hours, DIAD is only a "snapshot," but it "is quick and involves lots of people."

The facilitator asked participants to read the article she and the principal, Fred, had prepared about the process. Then, at 11:14 a.m., she interviewed the principal about his experience with DIAD. Fred, a humorous and enthusiastic participant, discussed wanting to conduct the process differently at his school, Bowman Elementary, than he had seen it implemented at an SCC meeting, where he felt it had been divorced from the participating school's context. Thus, when the SCC was invited to observe DIAD at his school, Fred discussed with Quest staff how to conduct the process in a way that would significantly impact the school community. Ultimately, he decided to design the process around Bowman Elementary's state-mandated school improvement plan. He noted the he had "no doubt that most schools have a mission and vision, but fewer use it to reflect and make changes." Rather, Fred hoped to "use [DIAD] to take a long hard look at the school, asking this question: If someone came in and read our mission and vision, would what they read be reflected in the actual school? Are we doing what we said we'd do?" Based on the school improvement plan, four theme areas became the foci for DIAD at Bowman: teaching and learning strategies that reach all children, appropriate student behavior, a culture for learning and academic focus, and high expectations for all students with appropriate academic support. Fred noted that teachers were then included in deciding what indicators might suggest the presence of the four theme areas. One of the facilitators then described the seven steps of DIAD: organizing and planning for the process, identifying themes for study, generating indicators for observation, collecting data, analyzing data, reporting findings, and continuing the conversations around the findings. The principal pointed out that because the Bowman school community generated the indicators, the resulting observation instrument was very non-threatening to them. He elaborated, sharing that he had invited not only teachers to participate, but also diverse students, parents, and support staff.

Once indicators were generated, Fred continued, the group broke into smaller research teams, each observing three classrooms for about 30 minutes. Following the observations, the research teams met to analyze and summarize their observations by the four themes. The next step involved the formation of new, larger teams, this time each representing one of the four theme areas. These groups were constructed in such a way that each team had observed a total of 18 classrooms and represented all grade levels observed. Teams analyzed the combined data from the smaller research teams with regard to their theme, and ultimately created a report that they presented to the entire faculty. Fred observed that the faculty "took" the report much better because it had been presented by research teams that included students, colleagues, and parents. As a result of the process, the principal said that an action plan had been crafted based upon the findings, and consequently several changes had been made at the school. In sum, he said that his school "continue[s] to reap benefits in lot of areas I didn't even dream it would." He told several stories to illustrate. During the final report to the faculty, for example, a student said that the faculty needed to increase their collaboration. A visiting curriculum director asked the student if she knew what collaboration was, to which the student replied, "It's when teachers get together to talk about how to help us better."

Fred laughed at this point in his story, "I couldn't have scripted this better! I can tell you, collaboration wasn't in her vocabulary the day before!"

The rally facilitators then provided time for participants to ask questions of Fred regarding DIAD. Attendees asked a variety of questions, some concerning the logistics of the process and others the impact it had on Bowman. The presentation concluded at 11:58, the participants applauding Fred.

The facilitators then shared that Fred had also been planning to discuss the use of the California Protocol at his school, but that lunch was to be served at noon. One facilitator decided that Fred might discuss it at a later rally more fully, but for now could give the other participants a brief description of the Protocol. Fred began by sharing that he had once been an elementary supervisor but had never looked at student work in efforts to improve learning. Thus, the two months spent using the California Protocol at his school to look at student writing were a revelation. One teacher had asked him after several cycles of using the process, "Are we doing this right?" To which Fred had replied, "I don't know what right is, but let me ask you this: Are you thinking about student writing more than you ever have?" Four teachers responded without pause, "Yes." The principal briefly described the Protocol as a "simple, forced way to look at student work." A group of approximately eight students and teachers met to analyze various pieces of student work, discussing ways in which teachers might support improved student writing. One of their conclusions was that student writing was not as good as they might hope because teachers themselves were not as prepared to teach writing as they could be. As a result, the Protocol participants decided to share their thoughts and recommendations with other colleagues, choosing to focus collectively, for instance, on helping student writers to stay on the main idea in their work. Another way the Protocol impacted the school, Fred shared, was that students participating in the process came to view writing not as work assigned by the teacher, but rather as their own work. A facilitator noted that the SCC had observed faculty at Bowman conducting the Protocol; one of the SCC members said that Bowman displayed the best use of the Protocol that he had ever seen. Again, the participants applauded Fred's presentation, following which Quest staff dismissed attendees for lunch at 12:05.

The rally reconvened at 1:25 p.m. One of the facilitators described another method for assessing schools, the Walkabout, which a Quest network school had developed in order to get a "snapshot" of teaching and learning in four core academic areas. Each participating department at this school had reached consensus on indicators they would hope to find in content area classrooms, which they compiled into observation matrices. The facilitators provided examples of these for rally participants.

Then the facilitators asked attendees to participate in an energizing activity in which groups spent several minutes getting to know one another. Following this, they were to identify a commonality within their groups, unique traits, and a common goal they shared for themselves or for Quest. Participants appeared to enjoy this activity, laughing and joking together as they strove to find similarities.

At 2:07, the facilitators introduced another form of sharing within the network. Dottie, a principal from Tinder Elementary, shared with participants a slide show of her school, telling the story of its development and current undertakings. Notably, several slides showed bulletin boards depicting the SMART learner theme. Participants appeared very attentive during the slide presentation; one participant, in fact, grinned widely throughout. Attendees applauded Dottie loudly as she concluded.

At 2:20, the facilitators spent more time discussing the California Protocol, referring to written descriptions of the process included in participant notebooks. Before beginning Protocol, the facilitators suggested, participants needed to determine their key questions and collect samples of student work. During the process, then, presenters would introduce and discuss the student work, analyzing it in terms of the key questions formulated earlier. Next, the audience would become "reflectors," asking clarifying questions and giving feedback both warm (supportive) and cool (critical) to the presenters. Finally, the presenters would reflect aloud on the feedback they had received and consider next steps. The facilitators noted throughout their presentation some of the advantages of the Protocol: "there's a norm of no one has the answers . . . of posing questions, not giving advice," "so a person can find answers inside yourself," "it's a true form of cooperative learning."

Beginning at 2:55, the facilitators led participants through the Interview Design process. One Scholar shared that she had used this activity with English teachers in her district, reporting that it "was their very favorite activity." In Interview Design, all participants interview and are interviewed regarding their responses to several questions. Two rows of chairs were set up facing one another, one pair of chairs per question. As the process began, participants faced each other and took turns asking the question found on the seat of their chairs, and recording each other's answer. Next, the facilitator asked that each participant in only *one* of the rows move to the seat to his or her right, while the participant on the end of the row moved to the seat at the beginning of the row. Then the process continued with participants asking the new people with whom they found themselves faced the question they had found on their original seats. This seat-switching continued until all the questions were asked of all the participants. The conference room became filled with voices during this activity, as people talked, laughed, and jotted notes. The facilitator allotted approximately two minutes to each question; some participants found that they had more to say when time was called, while others provided their answers more quickly.

At 3:30, a facilitator announced that, once all the questions had been answered, the data collection stage was over. The second stage involved analysis of the interview responses. To this end, participants who had originally sat opposite each other as the activity began reconvened to analyze replies they had received to their question. Following this analysis, larger groups convened, such that all participants asking a particular question met to combine analyses and write summaries. At 3:47, the facilitators noted that if the activity were conducted to a conclusion, each team would report their findings to all participants; however, Quest staff wanted to ensure that enough time remained for school teams to meet. Some participants said that they wanted to learn the results from Interview Design, and Quest staff replied that they might share them the following day.

The facilitators asked attendees for comments regarding the Interview Design process. These included, "non-threatening," "as you go through, you are relaxing more," "even more non-threatening because they were writing down [my comments]—gee, what I'm saying is important," and "at first is seems like you're taking risks, but when you meet back with your partner, you are reconfirmed in your beliefs."

At 3:54, Quest staff asked school teams to meet in order to discuss what they had learned, what they might consider using at their schools, questions they had, and next steps teams might undertake. They asked each team to identify a scribe to document their discussions, for use the following day. One group discussed wanting to obtain more information about a student values and behavior program another network team had described using. Another team conversed about the California Protocol, while another considered undertaking classroom visitations. At 4:05, the facilitators announced that school teams would convene again in the morning, that dinner was to be served at 6:00 p.m., and that they hoped participants had made some new connections.

Interestingly, although the facilitators verbally wrapped up the day's activity at 4:05, some teams, busily discussing their thoughts and plans, did not disband until 4:54. The Scholars, in addition, met for approximately 45 minutes to discuss the rally thus far, tomorrow's activities, and procedures for involving Quest network members in collecting student achievement and school data for the purpose of evaluating the impact of the project on participating schools.

Day Two

The second, and final, day of the rally began at 8:15 a.m., following breakfast served in the conference room. One of the facilitators told the evaluator in an aside that a discussion with network members about the creation of school portfolios would be removed from the agenda because the rally schedule was "bursting at the seams." Meanwhile, participants munched breakfast, got themselves cups of coffee, and convened at tables with their school teams.

At 8:15, one of the facilitators asked participants if they would not mind beginning activities early rather than at 8:30, when the day's events were scheduled to begin. She noted that several activities had been eliminated, but that there nonetheless remained much to cover. Many attendees nodded in agreement; none protested.

A facilitator began by discussing Quest. "One of the things we're excited about is that Quest is an evolving project . . . We're learning together about continuous improvement . . . One of our puzzlements is how to depict our findings. We want to share one way [of doing this]. The framework [for continuous improvement] is the unifying thought . . . We are envisioning a book, like a toolkit or handbook . . . One example is Senge's *Fifth Discipline* . . . which has stories to exemplify the concepts . . . We would like to include your stories [in our book] . . . For example, a story about something you've done to move toward improving school culture . . . Like Fred might write about Data in a Day as an effort to improve culture . . . It's real exciting to think about coming together to work on this collaboratively." The other facilitator then discussed a method for gathering

participants' stories. Attendees had been given large white index cards, on which they were instructed to write an idea for a story or a full story, along with their names and phone numbers. A Quest staff member suggested that an AEL employee might call them at some point to interview them about their story, and that AEL writers and editors were a source of support should the stories be selected for publication.

At 8:29, participants began to talk quietly at their tables about stories, while others immediately began to write. A facilitator put instrumental music on the compact disk player quietly. Meanwhile, four new participants arrived, and the facilitators briefly introduced them to the other participants. One group discussed whether the stories were meant to address changes due to Quest or were intended to reflect components of the Quest framework. They decided to focus upon framework components. Most attendees wrote diligently for several minutes.

Several minutes after a timer rang at 8:35, one of the facilitators asked a participant about the compact disk of music she had brought that was playing in the background. The attendee explained that the music had been written at 60 beats per minute to approximate a heart beat. She said that the composer intended the music to "fit with natural rhythms" and to be used with children. Moreover, she shared that she played the music over the intercom in the mornings at her school, while a teacher there also played it during morning activities because it "helps kids calm down and get to work." She also noted that there was no repetition in the music, so listeners do not listen for refrains and therefore tend to listen to the music as soothing background noise. Several other attendees asked her for further information about the music and composer.

Following this conversation, the facilitators asked participants to find a partner with whom to share the stories they had just written. For approximately five minutes, attendees milled about finding partners and then discussed their stories. The room became loud as participants talked in pairs, leaned in to listen, and laughed together occasionally. Quest staff collected the index cards.

At 8:47, the facilitators conducted a gallery walk, in which participants formed groups that each spent several minutes at stations throughout the conference room. Each station presented findings on butcher paper from the previous day's Interview Design activity, as the facilitators had promised.

At 9:07, attendees were asked to convene in role-alike groups, such that all teachers met as one group, parents as another, administrators in yet another, and students in a fourth. These groups were then to reconsider their responses to several questions they had discussed at the close of the previous day's activities. These questions concerned what had been learned and what processes or ideas might be used back in network members' schools.

Next, the facilitators requested that each role-alike group report one concern or view. The parent group reported that, "we have lots of parent energy. The question is how to channel it." They noted that there were a few forums for parents, but less were available at the high school level. In reply, the facilitators thanked the parents for attending, saying they "applaud you for taking the time

to come [to the rally]." The administrators reported that "most important is allowing teachers time to communicate and share." They said they were not sure of the structure to allow such communication, but were convinced that they needed to give their teachers more time for sharing. The student group reported that the rally was a nice experience but did not include as much student voice as other rallies had. The facilitators, in response, expressed their regret that fewer students were in attendance but extended an invitation to schools to bring more students to upcoming rallies. The teachers had formed two groups: high school and elementary. The high school teachers shared that they liked the California Protocol from what they had heard and wanted to use it in their classrooms. They also reported thinking the Walkabout form of peer evaluation might be useful and non-threatening. The elementary school teachers said that they had learned of many "good ideas," including the California Protocol and DIAD. One teacher described her school's strategy for freeing up time in order that grade level teachers might plan monthly interdisciplinary lessons. Finally, one school met as a team. Planning to use Interview Design to explore issues of implementing continuous improvement reforms, this team reported that they had used the time to craft questions for the process.

At 9:30, a facilitator requested that participants ready themselves to move into a new configuration. In this activity, eight or nine attendees who had participated in a co-venture (Quest site visit) were to sit in a circle, or a "fishbowl." Around them in a larger circle were the remaining rally attendees, who were to listen to the inner circle participants.

The facilitator explained that the purpose of this activity was to explore how the co-ventures had worked for participants. After briefly giving a description of the co-ventures, the facilitator commenced the activity. She asked open-ended questions concerning participant assessment of preparation and planning for the co-ventures, challenges they faced in relation to the co-ventures, and what benefits they derived from the co-ventures. She further asked what advice participants might offer other school teams and AEL staff when undertaking co-ventures.

Those in the innermost circle participated actively, offering their comments and insights. The outer circle remained quiet and appeared attentive. Inner circle participants reported that the co-ventures had generally been quite non-threatening, and that they had received worthwhile and objective feedback from Quest staff as a result. Some challenges included scheduling co-ventures, teachers who were concerned Quest staff had ulterior motives for conducting the visit, and ensuring that Quest visitors observed and interviewed a representative sampling of the school communities. Despite several challenges school staff faced in preparing for and conducting the co-ventures, much participant assessment of the visits was quite positive. At 10:17, the facilitator thanked the participants and dismissed them for a break.

The rally reconvened at 10:34, with participants returning to their school teams. One of the facilitators previewed the next activity by describing edits the Quest Scholars had performed on the elementary and high school creeds created at earlier rallies. After describing the Scholars Program briefly, some Scholars contributed their impressions of it. One Scholar said the program had given him "renewed commitment to Quest." Another Scholar shared that she had presented a report about

the Scholars colloquium to her Quest team members. A third reported that, "For me, Quest in general and the Scholars too . . . it's the people involved. I'm just so energized after these [rallies]. I go back and don't focus, but then [we talk and say] 'remember the lady with such and such hair, and she said such and such!'"

A facilitator then quickly reviewed the way in which the creeds had been generated and then revised by the Scholars. She said the next step, led by two of the Scholars, would involve exploring how to finalize and use them. Then, the Scholars, Ursula and Lynn, reiterated the ways in which the Scholars had refined the creeds, noting that "we wanted to get at the heart of the matter. We didn't remove the personality [of the creeds], but we wanted to find the common threads. They're even more powerful now, I think." At 10:50, the two Scholars next directed the formation of teams who were to read the creeds and discuss their answers to two questions: what really speaks to you in each creed, and are there similarities between the elementary and high school creeds. "This will be our guiding beacon, so it's important to tackle this," encouraged Lynn, adding that the Scholars as a whole had felt it important for elementary and high school network members to discuss the feasibility of combining the creeds to form one for the entire network. As groups discussed the questions, each of the Scholars present sat with one of the groups.

At 11:14, the Scholars asked groups to finish their discussions. "Our goal was to get you familiar with the creeds and think about whether there are similarities," one shared. The other asked participants if they were willing to report about their conversations. Two groups made comments about the differences between the two creeds. Lynn then asked groups to quickly offer one similarity they had discerned, which they were able to do. "Keeping this in mind, and this is a true question, given the similarities and dissimilarities, where do we go next with this? Do we go all for one, to represent both networks? Or do we have one for each? Or some combination?" Lynn queried. But before providing time and process for answering the questions, Lynn briefly showed participants one Scholar's Venn diagram depicting the differences and similarities between the creeds.

The Scholars then asked groups to agree upon a recommendation for the creeds and write them on blue index cards. Groups talked loudly, debating the pros and cons of alternatives. At 11:33, Lynn requested that groups announce their recommendations. Interestingly, groups appeared evenly divided on the issue of combining creeds. Lynn suggested the possibility of combining similarities to create a network creed and using the differences to inform sub-creeds specific to each level. Some participants continued to advocate their recommendations. Lynn finished the activity by announcing that "the next step is developmental. I'll be finding a way to bring back [your recommendations] to the Scholars. Or if you feel especially passionate or have a perfect solution, call me or use E-mail. There will be no vote [on this matter] because we're not about winning. We are thinking about coming up with a solution that benefits all. Thank you." The participants applauded loudly, smiling and nodding.

At 11:45, the facilitators introduced an AEL staff member responsible for assisting states,

districts, and schools with negotiating the process of implementing comprehensive school reform models as stipulated by the Porter-Obey legislation. The staff member presented to participants details about Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration (CSRD) opportunities. "I'm so glad she's here," whispered one participant. The group broke for lunch at 12:05.

Rally activities began again at 1:15 p.m., with Lynn noting that some participants were feeling "unfinished" with regard to the creeds. She said that another Scholar, Carol, had a suggestion for a process to aid in resolving the issue. The creeds were posted on several pieces of butcher paper around the room. Participants were to put slash marks through components of each creed they "could not live with."

Following this, the facilitators introduced another activity, a modified focus group, that they described using at one of the Quest schools. The facilitators invited parents and students to sit in an inner circle; six accepted the invitation. Surrounding them were participants from the parents' and students' schools. A third, larger circle consisted of the remaining rally participants, who were simply to watch the process as enacted by the other two circles.

The facilitators then explained that the inner circle would first answer several open-ended questions. Meanwhile, the middle circle was to listen carefully to the inner circle, taking notes if necessary. After the inner circle had completed their discussion, the two circles were to trade places. The middle circle, now in the inner circle, was then to share what they had heard the other participants say.

The facilitator began by asking what participants hoped their schools would do for them or for their children. Two of the students were fairly reticent during the process, while another spoke more often. The parents were less reluctant to become involved in the discussion, and spoke most often. The middle circle listened attentively, taking notes and sitting still. After approximately 15 minutes, a facilitator stopped the process and asked the two circles to trade places. Next, she asked the participants newly relocated to the inner circle to mention one thing that had "struck home, was a surprise, or a confirmation." Those in the circle shared what they had heard, including "kids *want* to be challenged" and "I heard ideas about involving parents differently."

The facilitator ended the activity after one round of comments, noting that the process might have continued much longer. "You can imagine how powerful it would be with all students [in your school participating]," she added. Another facilitator then introduced the principal from a Quest school, Kevin, who described how the process had been experienced at his newly consolidated high school. After talking about the context and climate of his new school, and the purposes for conducting the modified focus group, Kevin shared that the process had generated "honest assessments," including revelations that students "know when teachers use the block [schedule] appropriately or not, when they waste time, when they're teaching fluff . . ." In sum, he said, "I wish everyone [at my school] had been there . . . It was very productive." Rally attendees applauded Kevin as he completed his presentation. One of the facilitators who had helped conduct the activity

at Kevin's school added, "Kids said it, teachers heard it." She told a story about a reluctant teacher who took student comments seriously: "One teacher came in with body language saying 'I don't want to be here.' When they moved to the inner circle, she said that she would ask herself each day, "Am I being enthusiastic? Am I teaching for understanding?"

Participants continued to discuss the process and its potential uses for several more minutes before the facilitators announced that the group needed to move on to the remaining activities. Thus, at 2:05, Quest staff said that Lynn would conduct the last major rally activity. Staff explained that the Scholars had generated a list of 23 indicators of student performance, that they had then condensed to 17. These indicators represented possible data that Quest schools might collect to document their growth during the project. Lynn noted that through the next activity, "we're asking for your help." Participants were to read the list of indicators, displayed on two large pieces of butcher paper on two sides of the room. They were then to come to consensus in their small groups about which six items were the most important indicators of student performance. Once consensus was reached, the groups were to post blue dots next to the indicators they had rated most highly. At the end of this phase of the activity, those receiving the most dots included measures of more positive student feelings toward school and learning, increased student voice, student goal setting and mentoring, and enhanced interrelatedness of curriculum.

At 2:20, Lynn directed attendees to reach consensus in their groups about which six indicators were most measurable and indicate their votes using another set of colored dots. Once voting was completed, it was apparent there were disparities between what was considered most important and most measurable. Indicators rated as most measurable included teacher attendance rates, dropout rates, number of discipline incidents, and standardized test scores.

Lynn next asked participants to reconvene in their school teams in order to discuss what six pieces of data each would be willing to collect to document their evolution during the Quest project. One group asked, "Why is it important to measure?" To which Lynn replied, "Because we're judged by what's measured." A facilitator shared a quote she had heard, "What gets measured gets done." Later, another participant added, "If we believe in this, then we'll want information to capture our growth." Groups then spent about 10 minutes discussing what data they might collect and casting their votes using yet another set of colored dots. Several indicators received the most votes, including standardized test scores, number of discipline incidents, increase in learner-centered activities, reduction in pockets of "non-mastery" on achievement tests, and more positive student feelings toward school and learning.

As attendees completed this activity Lynn explained that it had taken three times as long as she had planned because "it's real." She shared that her Quest team had designed a day of staff development about Quest for her school, "so we know what goes into this. So I want to give the AEL folks a hand." Participants applauded loudly, some smiling and nodding. A facilitator then said that she likewise wanted to thank Lynn, who also received a round of enthusiastic applause mixed with verbal praise of her efforts.

One of the facilitators announced that the Quest staff had planned to allot 30 minutes for school teams to plan, but that time was running short. In addition, she said that the Quest project supervisor had an announcement to make. The supervisor then shared with participants that AEL had made small grants available to Quest schools to help defray expenses associated with attending project events. In return, she noted that schools would be asked to sign a cooperative agreement, indicating their willingness to continue participating in the network. This received happy applause.

The facilitators then quickly asked attendees to consider weekly Quest team meetings, the collection of stories related to continuous improvement, and the compilation of school portfolios or journals. Following this, they distributed several print resources and thanked the participants for their involvement and work, one contributing, "It's exciting to see you take charge." School teams were next provided some time to discuss their plans.

At 2:55, Quest staff asked school teams to share what plans they had made. One school team reported that they intended to conduct Interview Design in order to develop a school vision. Another said they hoped to use Interview Design in their classrooms and wanted AEL to help facilitate it with parents and faculty in order to inform a school improvement plan. A third school shared that they hoped to increase district support for Quest, add more parents to their Quest team, and commit to weekly Quest team meetings. Another school team said they were "really excited" because their Quest team had grown so much. They intended to conduct bi-weekly Quest team meetings. Bi-weekly meetings and the addition of students and parents to the Quest team were the aims of yet another school. One school reported planning to enact several changes, including replacing the long, rectangular table used for site-based decision making council meetings with a round table to enhance communication amongst members. This school also aimed to use the modified focus group to explore some policy issues, to explore using DIAD and the California Protocol, and to consider ways of including student voice in council meetings. Using DIAD as a self-evaluation method was the intention of another school team, who additionally hoped to conduct modified focus groups. A final school team reported that they planned to conduct Interview Design with their faculty in order to consider discipline issues. They also aimed to incorporate the SMART learner component of the Quest framework into their school, and said that they had a "commitment to do a co-venture."

At 3:10, the facilitators announced potential dates for the winter rally, the summer symposium, and the following fall rally. Then the participants diligently completed evaluation forms, gathered their belongings, and said goodbye to each other. Some attendees stayed in the conference room past 3:30, talking with Quest staff and other participants. Quite a few hugged goodbye.

FINDINGS

Follow Up

A total of 32 (80%) participants completed the follow up questionnaire distributed at the beginning of the rally. Of these, 15 belonged to the high school network and 17 to the elementary network. Sixteen reported having attended no Quest events prior to the rally. Six respondents reported attending one Quest event, seven reported two events, and three reported three events. Respondents also were asked how many Quest events other Quest teammates had attended. Fifteen wrote that other Quest team members had attended two events. One reported that no one had attended a Quest event before, while six said that teammates had attended one previous event and nine reported teammates had attended three events.

Participants were asked in what ways earlier Quest events had been useful to them. Thirteen did not reply or responded that the query was not applicable to their experience. Four replied fairly generically that they had encountered new ideas or had learned much at prior events. Five reported that their teaming efforts had been supported by various Quest meetings, one writing, for instance, "Team building, the networking among and with other incredible professionals is so vitally important to my professional growth. Building a foundation/team among members of my own school staff and seeing that we are all moving in the same direction." Another wrote that what was helpful to her was "establishing a team of teachers for support—moral support and encouragement." Similarly, three others noted that the events had brought their faculty together around a common goal. One of these wrote that a rally several school staff attended had "helped create more unity between elem[entary] and high school staffs." Another wrote, "The rallies cause me and our team to think about the actual strengths and weaknesses of our school. This then spills over to goal setting personally and as a faculty." Three respondents reported that they had found useful information concerning specific techniques, strategies, and concepts. These included the framework for continuous improvement, the SMART learner component of the framework and Monday morning meetings. Two participants wrote that previous Quest events had enhanced communication amongst school staff. One other respondent provided a more idiosyncratic response: "Gave me an insight to what actually happens in schools and how teachers think."

Another question on the pre-rally questionnaire requested information regarding what activities Quest teams had undertaken as a result of participating in the project. Eight respondents described schoolwide in-services or workshops they had conducted based around Quest concepts. Four discussed student recognition programs; two of these also mentioned creating school improvement plans. Four more respondents noted having participated in a Quest co-venture, one of whom also wrote of attending an SCC meeting and using the SMART learner theme throughout the school. Other responses were unique. One participant reported that the team had been "working to use dialogue and discussion effectively for change and to solve problems." Another wrote that the team had considered several school goals, and another conducted a school survey. A final respondent reported having "worked to make students more responsible." Ten respondents did not reply or indicated that the question was not applicable.

Next, respondents were asked what, if any, changes had taken place in their schools which they might attribute to involvement with Quest. Twelve did not respond and one replied, "Not sure." Three reported that daily grade level planning had been instituted at their schools, while another three reported that Quest teams had been built and members were becoming closer and increasingly supportive. Two reported the implementation of block scheduling, another two the institution of a value of the month program, and two the use of SMART learners as a schoolwide theme. Another two respondents wrote that they had become more involved with school improvement efforts at their school more generally. The remaining replies were unique. One noted that standardized test scores had increased, another reported aiding in the creation of division goals, and another participated in a co-venture. One participant wrote that "a team applied and was accepted as participants at the [state] teacher leadership academy." And a final respondent noted, along with a smiley face, that she had been hired by her school.

Respondents were asked to what extent they had been in contact with other network members since the last event they had attended. Nine did not reply, and 11 reported that had not been in contact with other Quest members. One reported having attempted to visit another school: "We tried to visit Brownville in April/May to observe Microsociety and relate it to the Mini Society program we do, but their schedule would not accommodate." Eleven participants reported contact of some sort, several reporting multiple types of contact. Two respondents wrote of visiting other Quest schools, five reported participating in a co-venture (although this activity did not involve network members from other schools), and seven said they had been in contact via E-mail. Some of these responses included "yes, not as much as I would like, though. I have used listserv and E-mail," "Yes. Our group is visiting Brownville Elem[entary] on Wednesday," and "Eva has been in touch with [Quest staff] through E-mail. E-mail communications sent from AEL—Thank you!"

Finally, network members were asked in what ways Quest might better support their continuous improvement efforts. Nineteen did not respond to this query, representing the largest number of non-responses on any feedback form completed during the rally. Four simply requested that Quest staff continue their current efforts. As one such respondent said, "Just keep the great ideas and information coming—Challenge us—Make us a bit uncomfortable—Create cooperative disorder." One participant replied that assistance with funding would be helpful, while three thought site visits from AEL would be useful. As one participant put it, "I think the onsite visit will be very helpful in analyzing our strengths/weaknesses and helping to develop a direction for improvement." Five participants provided idiosyncratic responses. One wrote that "We need to use the resources that are available to us," while another wrote "Faculties need to continue to come together more often." And one respondent hoped for more local support: "More support and involvement from administration." One comment implied that Quest provided adequate support already: "I'm just looking forward to learning more." Another participant requested that Quest "provid[e] information and resources."

Achievement of Rally Goals

The extent to which rally goals were achieved at the November rally is discussed in the following section. Data are drawn from participant observation, informal interviews, two open-ended feedback forms, and one Likert-type rating scale. Interestingly, four of the means for the Likert-type assessment of rally goals were 4.51, although these had standard deviations ranging from .56 to .73. Overall, means ranged from 4.51 to 4.81 (see Table 1).

One open-ended feedback form was distributed at the end of the first day of the rally. Twenty-nine forms were completed, representing a return rate of 73%. A second open-ended feedback form was distributed at the end of the rally, 35 (88%) of which were completed and returned. The scale assessing achievement of rally goals was also given to participants at the end of the event. Thirty-seven were completed, a return rate of 93%. The Cronbach's Alpha, indicating internal reliablity, was satisfactory at .76 for this administration of the scale.

Table 1

Participant Rating of the Achievement of Rally Goals

	Mean	SD*	N
Goal One: Connect with Colleagues	4.65	.68	37
Goal Two: Create a Learning Community	4.51	.56	37
Goal Three: Connect with Concepts Related to School Improvement	4.51	.73	37
Goal Four: Create Personal and Shared Meaning	4.51	.61	37
Goal Five: Commit to Continue Learning with this Community	4.51	.65	37
Goal Six: Commit to Continue The Quest Back Home	4.81	.46	37

*Standard Deviation

Goal One: Connect with Colleagues

Asked on the final evaluation form with what they had connected, 18 of 35 (51%) respondents reported that they had connected with colleagues. Of these, eight wrote that they had made connections with people on their Quest school teams, while the remaining ten reported connections with colleagues other than those on their teams. One participant wrote of connecting with "high school members of our group whom I really don't have contact with," while another wrote of making connections with "the new members of our team." Of those responding in terms of having connected with colleagues other than those from their schools, one wrote that s/he had

connected with "several other principals in the fact that teachers are reluctant to have other teachers watch them teach." This respondent appeared to have made a more or less substantive connection, then, with others. Other participants replied, for example, that they had connected with "other colleagues on shared ideas" and "old Quest friends."

However, one attendee reported little connection, writing "I don't feel very connected . . . other than I really agreed with Dottie's assessment of Quest as a hybrid environment for sharing in a non-threatening situation." Thus, although another participant's observation resonated with this respondent, s/he nonetheless felt disconnected from others at the rally.

The achievement of the goal concerning connecting with colleagues received the second highest mean rating from participants. With a mean of 4.65 (SD .68), most attendees appeared to feel that the goal of connecting with their colleagues had been quite well met.

Goal Two: Create a Learning Community

Receiving a mean rating of 4.51 (SD .56) on a 5-point scale, the goal of creating a learning community seemed to have been achieved well, according to most rally participants. A few written comments also suggest that the development of a learning community was ongoing. Asked on the final evaluation form by what they felt renewed at the rally, thirteen of the 35 respondents cited sharing ideas with other network members. Some of these included, "joining with other committed educators," "working with my own colleagues and sharing with others," "hearing success stories and having one to tell," and "hearing others want to improve the quality of education." Such quotes suggest that attendees found energizing the opportunity to discuss school improvement issues with others. In terms of the creation of an inclusive learning community, one participant was overheard telling a facilitator, "I've been around a lot of participatory research . . . I'm really excited that you walk the talk." In response to the query regarding renewal, one respondent reported being renewed by "being asked to help present" during the rally.

Other possible indicators of the emergence of a learning community included the degree to which participants valued storytelling by network schools. Asked for their assessment of this on the final evaluation form, 27 of the 35 respondents made unambiguously positive comments. These included, "Tinder [Elementary] was great!" "I thought this was wonderful and I always enjoy hearing from other schools," "loved talking with Fred! He always offers so much!" and "always the best! Dottie and Fred did great!" Several of these indicate familiarity with some of the participants, as well as a sense of appreciation for each others' efforts. The use of the word "always" especially suggests that participants knew enough of one another to make such an assessment. Other comments suggested that participants learned from one another during network storytelling. For instance, one respondent reported "sharing helped me understand and appreciate the way certain problems were approached and solved. It gave me 'fuel for the fire.'" Another said "stories of success are always welcome and lead to even new ideas." In an informal interview, a participant said, "One of the nice things about this time together is that we can talk

about what we do," indicating her appreciation of the time away from school to talk with colleagues about their common work.

Three respondents found network storytelling at least minimally valuable, but also made critiques, while another two offered negative assessments. These comments were "nice, but too slow," "insightful, difficult to get detailed information," "alright, but not too interesting," "the elementary schools did not relate to the high school[s]," and "wasn't enough sharing." Other evidence of disjunctions within the nascent learning community include comments made by parents during an activity. One parent said, "I think this is a really big workshop for the teachers . . . [there are] good ideas . . . but it's for the teachers." This parent, then, felt the content of the rally was more appropriate for teachers and less so for others. Another parent reported, "I've been on the Quest team for a year and haven't yet found my place on it. We all do things to support the school, but it's outside and separate from [the school]." This comment further indicates that some parents may continue to feel uncertain of their role in Quest and continuous school improvement.

Students, too, reported that they felt less involved than they might have liked. In an informal group interview, they made comments such as, "[The rally] doesn't really apply," "kinda boring," "I'm not disappointed . . . it's a learning experience . . . I didn't know what to expect," "there's too much lecture," and "it's more for teachers." Thus, the students did not seem to feel they were an integral part of a larger learning community.

Goal Three: Connect with Concepts Related to Continuous School Improvement

The extent to which this goal was achieved received a mean score of 4.51 on the 5-point scale, indicating that many participants deemed it well met. Of the four items with means of 4.51, this displayed the highest standard deviation of .73, revealing that there was more dispersion of ratings.

Written feedback on the open-ended forms, however, was somewhat more ambiguous with regard to how well the goal of connecting with continuous school improvement was achieved. In response to the prompt "Learnings, insights, aha's . . ." nearly all respondents answered in terms of specific techniques presented at the rally. Only a few reported any substantive or conceptual learnings. These included "the need for shared vision and the factors that allow or inhibit it," "vision is the seed of the learning culture, sharing ideas is essential for re-energizing," and "I am interested in involving students in assessment of their own work." One respondent did not reply to this question.

While most respondents replied to the prompt on the final evaluation form "I connected with . . ." in terms of colleagues, one wrote of connecting with the SMART component of the Quest framework and another reported connecting with "shared vision and how to obtain it." Three respondents reported connecting with ideas generally, but did not specify.

Likewise, when asked what had piqued their curiosity at the rally, most respondents replied in terms of specific techniques presented at the rally. Only a few participants discussed what might be considered continuous school improvement concepts. One respondent wrote of being curious about "schoolwide community! We need more help with this concept! We are a 'top down' school!" More vague replies included "ways to improve student learning," "leadership possibilities," and "learner centered activities." Two respondents did not answer this question.

Participants were asked following the rally to evaluate how well the review of the Quest framework "worked" for them. Twenty-six of the 35 (75%) who responded felt that the review had been, for instance, "vital" and "needed." Other comments included "I am new to the program so it was helpful," "I'm beginning to get the idea . . .," "This was good not only for me because I had heard it before, but because there were new people," and "Now I understand more what Quest is about." Thus, respondents seem to have connected with the Quest framework and the components therein. Three participants, however, assessed the review less well. One noted that "it was kind of hard to understand," while another wrote that it "was a bit broad for a person who had not attended previous rallies." The third critique was that the review was "too fast—not enough time to discuss key concepts." Six participants did not reply. It appears, then, that the review of the framework resonated with many participants, but was unsatisfactory to a few others.

Goal Four: Create Personal and Shared Meaning

Participants rated the degree to which this goal was met with a mean score of 4.51 (SD .61) on the 5-point scale. This indicates that they felt personal and shared meaning had been created at the rally.

There were several qualitative indicators that this goal had or had not been achieved. For instance, on the first evaluation form, when asked what "learnings, insights, or a-ha's" they had gained, most respondents replied in terms of specific techniques of which they had learned. None gave responses indicating any substantive meaning or sense-making.

However, when asked on the final evaluation form by what they had been personally renewed, many respondents provided glimpses of what meaning they had made during the rally. For instance, one participant wrote of being renewed by the Interview Design process because "it made me think and discuss my own views," while another reported feeling renewed by "a peek into a renewed sense of educational reevaluation." Yet another wrote of "reaffirming what I believe about education."

The presence of shared meaning was much more difficult to ascertain. The creeds represent an expression of shared meaning, and indeed most participants appeared to subscribe to them. However, approximately half believed that separate creeds were necessary for each network.

Goal Five: Commit to Continue Learning with This Community

On the final evaluation form, participants were asked to what they were now committed. Interestingly, only three of the 35 respondents specifically reported that they were committed to Quest itself. One wrote, for instance, of being committed to "Quest ideals," while another cited "continuing [the] Quest venture." Twenty-two respondents noted their commitment to some form of action in their schools, and of these, eight reported commitment to instituting or continuing a Quest-informed activity or to enhancing their Quest team.

Participants rated the extent to which the goal to commit to continue learning with the Quest community had been achieved rather highly, with a mean score of 4.51 (SD .65).

Goal Six: Commit to Continue the Quest Back Home

The degree to which the goal of committing to continue the Quest for school improvement back in their schools had been met was rated most highly by participants. With a mean of 4.81 (SD .46), most respondents believed that this goal had been quite well achieved.

Asked on the final feedback form to what they were committed, 22 of 35 respondents (63%) reported being committed to some form of school improvement effort in their schools. Some of these commitments included "Helping my school system improve and helping my students learn better," "Following through with school improvement goals," "Implementing school improvement activities which involve students and parents as well as teachers and staff," and "Supporting TES staff in exploring avenues for improvement and in implementing same." Other comments were more specific, including commitment to "Trying to implement some of the great ideas—DIAD/Interview Proc[illegible]ss [sic]/Circle Questioning" and "Suggesting a meeting of Quest members monthly." Another respondent wrote of being committed to "Helping my principal give up control and let us be empowered!!" One participant wrote of being committed to "nothing definite," and another did not reply to this prompt.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

On both open-ended feedback forms and during rally activities, respondents cited often the value of learning specific needs assessment, self-assessment, and data collection techniques. In reply to a variety of questions on these forms, participants consistently reported appreciating the opportunity to become familiar with Data in a Day, Interview Design, and the California Tuning Protocol. Ultimately, it appears that participants connected with strategies related to continuous school improvement, if not necessarily concepts thus related.

While not overwhelming, there was some evidence that a few participants felt a disjuncture between the elementary and high school networks. Several participants voiced this sense, and roughly half of those present expressed their belief that one creed for both networks was untenable. On the other hand, half believed such a creed was viable. A facet of the goal pertaining to connection with colleagues, this suggests that connection may have been uneven due to differences in school level of attendees.

Students and some parents continued to feel that their role was ambiguously defined and that they were less than fully involved in Quest. As one student phrased it, the rally was "more for teachers." This suggests that connection with concepts of continuous school improvement and with colleagues may have been hampered for students and parents.

Many attendees, both newcomers and veteran members, expressed appreciation for the review of the framework for continuous improvement. They reported that it helped orient, or reorient, them to the conceptual locus of the project. As one respondent put it, "Now I understand more what Quest is about." Only three participants found the review unsatisfactory. It appears that a review of Quest facilitates connection with the project and continuous school improvement.

This rally appeared to continue the trend of providing school community members energy for undertaking continuous school improvement endeavors. The rally goal of committing to continue Quest-related efforts back at their schools received the highest mean rating of the six goals. In addition, participants discussed a variety of plans they intended to undertake at their schools following the rally. Therefore, the goals of committing to continue involvement in Quest and to undertake improvement work back at school seems to have been well met.

Finally, follow up prior to the rally indicated that some participants had found earlier Quest events useful in that they provided participants new ideas and strategies, supported teaming efforts, engaged teams around a common goal, and enhanced faculty communication. Respondents reported that teams had undertaken a variety of activities following prior project events, including schoolwide workshops regarding Quest themes, student recognition programs, school improvement plans, efforts to increase school community dialogue, and the creation of

improvement goals. Changes in schools that might be attributed to Quest, according to respondents, were daily grade level planning periods, block scheduling, a value of the month program, the use of the SMART learner concept as school rallying point, enhanced involvement with improvement efforts, and increased standardized test scores. Participants reported a relatively low level of contact with other Quest members, but some did occur, including visits to other schools and communication via E-mail. Only a few suggestions for improving Quest support to network schools were offered: provision of funding for participation, site visits, and information and resources. Otherwise, participants expressed satisfaction with Quest's assistance as schools undertook continuous improvement. In sum, Quest network members continue to find the project supportive of some of their school improvement efforts.

Recommendations

A few recommendations can be made based upon the data.

Quest staff should continue their vigilance in providing meaningful roles for students and parents. Some strategies for incorporating each group more fully might include activities designed specifically for students and for parents, student and parent caucuses during rallies, or whole group activities in which participants ponder what roles students and parents could assume.

The review of the framework for continuous improvement appears useful to network members both new and veteran. Project staff should consider continuing such a practice at upcoming events.

It appears that while network members have a degree of contact with each other between Quest gatherings, it is not widespread throughout the network. Staff could perhaps support such communication by moderating the project listserv more actively, continuing to provide mailing lists to members, and including participants in co-ventures to other schools.

Quest staff should continue to model specific strategies for data collection and needs assessment to network members. They might also consider modeling techniques for those farther along the improvement continuum. In other words, some network schools have conducted needs assessments using methods modeled during Quest events. Perhaps staff might introduce strategies that support specific improvement efforts, implementation issues, or evaluation for those schools.

In conjunction with the evaluator, Quest staff may need to consider ways of determining the creation of personal and shared meaning, as this appears to be one of the more difficult project goals to assess. It was unclear to the evaluator, for instance, whether participants did not report many substantive learnings because they were not thinking deeply or because they had already internalized Quest norms and notions and were simply ready to learn new techniques.

Overall, network members appear to be quite pleased with Quest at this point, particularly in terms of how well it enhances their commitment to local school improvement efforts. While the achievement of this goal is quite important to Quest, project staff may want to consider ways to support more explicitly the achievement of the other five project goals.

REFERENCES

Appalachia Educational Laboratory. (1997). *Creating energy for school improvement.* Charleston, WV: Author.

Becker, H. S., & Geer, B. (1957). Participant observation and interviewing: A comparison. *Human Organization*, 16: 28-32.

Brewer, J., & Hunter, A. (1989). *Multimethod research: A synthesis of styles.* Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Denzin, N. K. (1989). *The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods* (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

Emerson, R. M. (1983). *Contemporary field research: A collection of readings.* Prospect Heights: Waveland Press.

Glazer, M. (1972). *The research adventure: Promise and problems of fieldwork.* New York: Random House.

Hammersley, M., & Atkinson, P. (1983). *Ethnography: Principles in practice.* New York: Routledge.

Howley-Rowe, C. (1998a). *Evaluation of Quest elementary school network Inquiry into Improvement conference, November 1997.* Charleston, WV: Appalachia Educational Laboratory.

Howley-Rowe, C. (1998b). *Evaluation of Quest elementary school network rally, February 1998.* Charleston, WV: Appalachia Educational Laboratory.

Howley-Rowe, C. (1998c). *Evaluation of Quest high school network Inquiry into Improvement Conference, October 1997.* Charleston, WV: Appalachia Educational Laboratory.

Howley-Rowe, C. (1998d). *Evaluation of Quest high school network rally, February 1998.* Charleston, WV: Appalachia Educational Laboratory.

Howley-Rowe, C. (1998e). *Evaluation of Quest Scholars Colloquium, July 1998.* Charleston, WV: Appalachia Educational Laboratory.

Howley-Rowe, C. (1998f). *Evaluation of Quest summer symposium, August 1998.* Charleston, WV: Appalachia Educational Laboratory.

Howley-Rowe, C. (1998g). *Interview evaluation of Leadership to Unify School Improvement Efforts (LUSIE)*. Charleston, WV: Appalachia Educational Laboratory.

Jorgensen, D. L. (1989). *Participant observation: A methodology for human studies*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Patton, M. Q. (1980). *Qualitative Evaluation Methods*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

Pre-Rally Questionnaire

Pre-Rally Questionnaire
Quest Network
Glade Springs, West Virginia
November 2-3, 1998

As you may know, Quest staff are interested in continuously improving this project. Your input is very valuable in helping us do this. Your answers will remain anonymous, so please respond as candidly as possible to the following questions. Thank you!

1. In which Quest network have you or your school team participated? (Please check one)
___ High School ___ Elementary

2. Not including this rally, how many Quest events have you attended?

3. Not including this rally, how many Quest events have other members from your school attended?

4. In what ways, if at all, were earlier Quest events you attended useful or helpful to you?

5. Since attending Quest events earlier in 1998, what, if anything, have you or your QUEST team done as a result of participating?

6. Since attending Quest events earlier in 1998, what, if any, changes have taken place at your school as a result of involvement with Quest?

7. Have you been in contact with other Quest network members? For what purposes? Was such contact helpful?

8. Based on your experiences this year with Quest, in what ways could Quest better support your continuous improvement efforts?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX B

Feedback Forms

Inquiry Into Improvment
Feedback Form

The rally planners would appreciate your comments based upon the first day's experience.

Learnings, insights, ah-ha's from the day...

Things that worked especially well for me...

Ways in which I contributed...

Things that would have allowed me to contribute more...

Things I want to explore further...

Things to trash...

Other comments:

QUEST: Inquiry Into Improvement

Please help us assess the learning experience for you by completing the following items.

I. Circle the number that best represents your thinking about the extent to which each of the following six goals were accomplished.

5 = Extremely well 3 = Average 1 = Not well accomplished

Goal 1: ***Connect*** with colleagues. 5 4 3 2 1

Goal 2: ***Create*** a learning community. 5 4 3 2 1

Goal 3: ***Connect*** with concepts related to continuous school improvement. 5 4 3 2 1

Goal 4: ***Create*** personal and shared meaning 5 4 3 2 1

Goal 5: ***Commit*** to continue learning with this community. 5 4 3 2 1

Goal 6: ***Commit*** to continue the QUEST back home. 5 4 3 2 1

Inquiry Into Improvment

Please give us your feedback about the rally. In the top four boxes, we are asking for your reaction to four different experiences offered at the rally. How did the following "work" for you:

Review of the framework?	Group processes?
Sharing of Network School Stories?	Home school team debriefs and planning?

In the bottom four boxes, we invite your comments to the following prompts:

I was personally renewed by...	My curiousity was piqued about...
I connected with...	I am committed to...

Use the back side of this paper to write other comments.

APPENDIX C

Completed Evaluation *Standards* Checklist

Citation Form

The Program Evaluation Standards (1994, Sage) guided the development of this (check one):

_____ request for evaluation plan/design/proposal
_____ evaluation plan/design/proposal
_____ evaluation contract
__X__ evaluation report
_____ other: _____

To interpret the information provided on this form, the reader needs to refer to the full text of the standards as they appear in Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, *The Program Evaluation Standards* (1994), Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage.

The *Standards* were consulted and used as indicated in the table below (check as appropriate):

Descriptor		The Standard was deemed applicable and to the extent feasible was taken into account.	The Standard was deemed applicable but could not be taken into account.	The Standard was not deemed applicable.	Exception was taken to the Standard.
U1	Stakeholder Identification	X			
U2	Evaluator Credibility	X			
U3	Information Scope and Selection	X			
U4	Values Identification	X			
U5	Report Clarity	X			
U6	Report Timeliness and Dissemination	X			
U7	Evaluation Impact	X			
F1	Practical Procedures	X			
F2	Political Viability			X	
F3	Cost Effectiveness	X			
P1	Service Orientation	X			
P2	Formal Agreements	X			
P3	Rights of Human Subjects	X			
P4	Human Interactions	X			
P5	Complete and Fair Assessment	X			
P6	Disclosure of Findings	X			
P7	Conflict of Interest	X			
P8	Fiscal Responsibility	X			
A1	Program Documentation	X			
A2	Context Analysis	X			
A3	Described Purposes and Procedures	X			
A4	Defensible Information Sources	X			
A5	Valid Information	X			
A6	Reliable Information	X			
A7	Systematic Information	X			
A8	Analysis of Quantitative Information	X			
A9	Analysis of Qualitative Information	X			
A10	Justified Conclusions	X			
A11	Impartial Reporting	X			
A12	Metaevaluation	X			

Name Caitlin Howley-Rowe Date: 12/17/98
(typed)
Caitlin Howley-Rowe
(signature)

Position or Title: Research Assistant

Agency: Appalachia Educational Laboratory

Address: P O Box 1348, Charleston, WV 25325

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Relation to Document: author
(e.g., author of document, evaluation team leader, external auditor, internal auditor)